



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/587,860

04/16/2007

Shigeki Machida

2006\_1242A

9752

513 7590 09/23/2008

WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P.

2033 K STREET N. W.

SUITE 800

WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1021

EXAMINER

ALLEN, MARIANNE P

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1647

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/23/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/587,860	<b>Applicant(s)</b> MACHIDA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Marianne P. Allen	<b>Art Unit</b> 1647	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 4-6 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 4-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/28/06</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.  |

### DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-3 have been cancelled and claims 4-6 have been newly introduced.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The specification exemplifies administering HGF to mice. HGF was administered intravitreally prior to retinal damage. The outer retinal layer is disclosed as being protected. Example 2 administers HGF to RCS mice (an animal model for hereditary photoreceptor degeneration). Retinopathy **was not** prevented as some damage is disclosed as occurring at 24 days. To prevent means to completely stop a condition from occurring. "Preventing" is not a relative term, it is total. A very high degree of evidence is required, which is accepted in the art, that an absolute protection from the pathology exists over an extended period of time. The present specification and prior art of record do not provide evidence or reason to believe that retinopathy can be prevented by administering HGF.

The particular HGF used does not appear to be disclosed. It is not known what species of HGF or whether a full length HGF was used. While the specification notes that HGF is a known protein, the specification makes clear that the claims encompass administration of variants and

Art Unit: 1647

modified forms. The term "HGF" cannot be considered to refer only to the naturally occurring protein. See at least pages 6-7 of the specification. The specification fails to identify those portions of HGF responsible for preventing or treating retinopathy, particularly resulting from damage and/or degeneration of the outer retinal layers, macular degeneration, or retinitis pigmentosa. As such, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been able to predict those HGF proteins that would have been expected to be operable in the methods of claims 4-6.

In *In re Wands* (8 USPQ2d 1400 (CAFC 1988)) the CAFC considered the issue of enablement in molecular biology. The CAFC summarized eight factors to be considered in a determination of "undue experimentation." These factors include: (a) the quantity of experimentation necessary; (b) the amount of direction or guidance presented; (c) the presence or absence of working examples; (d) the nature of the invention; (e) the state of the prior art; (f) the relative skill of those in the art; (g) the predictability of the art; and (h) the breadth of the claims. The present claims are considered to be an invitation to experiment. There is little direction or guidance in the specification. There is a single example that does not disclose the structure of the HGF protein used, the prior art was not aware of the ability of HGF to prevent retinopathy or to protect the outer retinal layers, the portions of HGF required for this activity are not disclosed, and the breadth of the claims is large.

The specification exemplifies only intravitreal injection. The specification and prior art of record do not demonstrate that methods of administration other than intravitreal injection would have been suitable or routinely used for administration of HGF to treat retinopathy. For example, the prior art of record does not establish that oral, intranasal, intramuscular,

Art Unit: 1647

transdermal, or rectal administration would have been routinely used by those of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention or expected to be effective.

Page 1 of the specification discloses that the outer retinal layers include Bruch's membrane, retinal pigment epithelial (RPE) cell layer, photoreceptor layer, outer limiting membrane, outer nuclear layer, and outer plexiform layer from the choroid side, and no blood vessel passes through this region.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Machida et al. (November 2004).

Applicant cannot rely upon the foreign priority papers to overcome this rejection because a translation of said papers has not been made of record in accordance with 37 CFR 1.55. See MPEP § 201.15.

Art Unit: 1647

Machida et al. disclose administering recombinant human HGF intravitreally to protect against retinopathy resulting from damage and/or degeneration of the outer retinal layers.

Treatment of retinitis pigmentosa is specifically disclosed. See at least abstract and page 4181.

Claims 5-6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Shibuki et al. (2002).

Shibuki et al. discloses intravitreal injection of recombinant human HGF to protect against retinopathy. Use of HGF in treating retinitis pigmentosa is specifically disclosed. See at least abstract, page 535, and Figure 5.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marianne P. Allen whose telephone number is (571)272-0712. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 5:30 am - 2:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Manjunath N. Rao can be reached on 571-272-0939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1647

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Marianne P. Allen  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1647

mpa